REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-15 are pending and under consideration.

None of the claims have been amended or cancelled.

Claims 1 and 8 are the independent claims.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. CITED REFERENCE

Applicants bring to the Examiner's attention that KR 1999-5264 cited in the rejection of claims 1-7, 9 and 10 has not been noted in PTO-892. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a revised PTO-892 be issued noting this document.

III. THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 8 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by applicants' admitted prior art (AAPA).

Regarding the rejection of claim 8, Applicants note that independent claim 8 recites a field-sequential liquid crystal display panel comprising, amongst other novel features, storage capacitors to sustain voltage applied to the cell electrodes; wherein the storage **capacitors** are provided **between** the **cell electrodes and** the **scan electrode lines**. Applicants respectfully assert that AAPA fails to teach or suggest each of these features.

The Office Action relies upon AAPA for such a teaching and in particular relies on FIG. 3 of the specification. However, FIG. 3 of AAPA illustrates a circuit diagram of a conventional field-sequential liquid crystal display panel. The crystal display panel includes cell regions made of thin film transistors 332 and cell electrodes E_{11R} through E_{31B}. Drains D of each of the thin film transistors 332 are respectively connected to the cell electrodes E_{11R} through E_{31B}. Gates G of the thin film transistors 332 are respectively connected to scan electrode lines LS_1 through LS_3, which are connected to the scan driver 54. Data electrode lines LD_1 through LD_3, which are connected to the data driver 55, are connected to sources S of the thin film transistors 332. Storage **capacitors** C_{11R} through C_{31B}, which sustain voltage after scanning, are respectively **coupled between** each of the **cell electrodes** E_{11R} through E_{31B} **and** corresponding **common electrode lines** COM (paragraph 0011).

In other words, AAPA discloses storage **capacitors** provided **between cell electrodes and** corresponding **common electrode lines** and is **not** concerned with providing storage **capacitors between** the **cell electrodes and** the **scan electrode lines**, as recited in independent claim 8.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) should be withdrawn because AAPA fails to teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 8.

As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)."

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claims 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) should be withdrawn at least because of their dependence from claim 8 and the reasons set forth above, and because the dependent claims include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12-15 also distinguish over the prior art.

IV. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reason.

Claim 11 depends from independent claim 8 and as noted above, AAPA fails to teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 8.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because AAPA fails to teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 8, upon which claim 11 depends.

Claims 1-7, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Kyung Sik Jo, KR 1999-005264 (Document 1).

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, Applicants note that independent claim 1 recites a field-sequential liquid crystal display panel comprising, amongst other novel features,

storage **capacitors** provided **between** each of the **cell electrodes and** a **respective one** of the **scan electrode lines**, to sustain voltages applied to the cell electrodes. Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of AAPA and Jo fails to disclose each of these features.

The Office Action relies upon AAPA for a teaching of thin film transistors, cell electrodes, scan electrode lines, data electrode lines and storage capacitors. The Office Action recognizes that AAPA fails to teach that the **capacitors** are provided **between** each of the **cell electrodes and** a **respective** one of the **scan electrode lines** and relies on Jo for such a teaching.

Jo discloses at FIG. 3, a TFT connected to an n-th gate line (Gn) on a liquid crystal panel which drives pixel electrodes on an (n+2)th gate line (Gn+2). A sustain capacitor (Cst) which is driven by the TFT is formed between the pixels on the (n+2)th gate line (Gn+2) and the drain of the TFT connected to Gn.

In other words Jo discloses a sustain **capacitor** formed **between pixels on Gn+2 and** the **drain** of the TFT connected to Gn, but fails to teach or suggest storage **capacitors** provided **between** each of the **cell electrodes and** a **respective one** of the **scan electrode lines**, as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because neither AAPA nor Jo, whether taken singly or combined teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claims 2-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn at least because of their dependence from claim 1 and the reasons set forth above, and because the dependent claims include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-7 also distinguish over the prior art.

Regarding the rejection of claims 9 and 10, it is noted that these claims depend from independent claim 8, and as noted above, AAPA fails to teach or suggest the features recited in independent claim 1.

Jo fails to cure the deficiencies of AAPA and therefore also fails to teach or suggest the features of independent claim 8.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because neither AAPA nor Jo, whether taken singly or

combined, teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 8, upon which claims 9 and 10 depend.

V. CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 2/27/06

By: Douglas Rodriguez
Douglas X. Rodriguez
Registration No. 47,269

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510